US010318

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-19 are pending, with claims 1 and 16-19 being independent. Claims 1, 11-14 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Humpleman. Claims 3 and 15-18 stand unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Humpleman in view Kido. Claims 4-7, 9 and 10 stand unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Humpleman in view of Knowles. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Humpleman.

35 USC 102(e) rejection of Claims 1, 11-14 and 19

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a method comprising, in part,

> configuring a reference information object model for use with the content-related information in accordance with a unified modeling language format, the reference information object model comprising a plurality of directly or indirectly interrelated classes each having at least one specified property; and
> configuring at least a portion of the content-related information for consistency with corresponding portions of the reference information model, the portion of the content-related information ... being selectively extractable by the electronic program guide of the first type and at least a second electronic program guide of a second type different than the first type in accordance with a specified semantic and syntactic consensus.

Humpleman is silent about and, thus, does not teach configuring a reference information *object* model in accordance with a *unified modeling language* (UML), as recited in amended Claim 1. The UML is an open method used to specify, visualize, construct and document the artifacts of an object-oriented software-intensive system under development. In Humpleman, classes of an information object system are added whenever the operator wants it. See Humpleman, col. 6, lines 56-60; col. 23, lines 2-7. Humpleman, accordingly, is also silent about selectively extracting a content-related information by multiple EPGs based on a specified semantic and syntactic consensus.

In contrast, utilizing the information object model, as recited in Claim 1, a system of multiple classes is set out in each of electronic program guides (EPG) and is operative to match the set out classes with those that any given EPG is capable of providing based on the principle of operation of an object model system which is configured in

8

accordance with the UML. Thus, Humpleman does not teach or suggest selectively extracting a portion of content related information by multiple EPGs in accordance with a specified semantics and syntactic consensus, as recited in Claim 1 which is, thus, patentable over Humpleman.

Claims 11-14 depend from Claim 1 and are patentable over Humpleman by virtue of their dependency from Claim 1.

Claim 19 reciting an article of manufacture has been amended similarly to Claim 1 and is believed to be patentable over Humpleman.

Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of Claims 3 and 15-18

The Examiner cites Kido to remedy the above discussed differences between the invention as now recited in Claim 1 and Humpleman. However, Kido does not disclose an object system configured in accordance with a UML. Nor does Kido suggest selectively extracting a content-related information by multiple EPGs based on a specified semantic and syntactic consensus. Accordingly Claims 3 and 15 depending from Claim are patentable over the proposed combination.

Independent Claims 16-18 each have been amended in accordance with Claim 1 and, therefore, recite the discussed limitations patentably distinguishing each of Claims 16, 17 and 18 from the Humpleman/Kido combination.

Withdrawal and reconsideration of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection are in order.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of Claims 4-7, 9 and 10

All of the rejected claims depend from Claim 1. Knowles cited by the Examiner in combination with Humpleman neither teaches nor suggests an object system configured in accordance with a UML, as presently recited in Claim 1. Knowles also does not suggest selectively extracting a content-related information by multiple EPGs based on a specified semantic and syntactic consensus, as recited in claim 1. Consequently, Knowles cannot cure the deficiencies of Humpleman. Applicants

9

respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 4-7, 9 and 10 be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of Claim 8

As discussed above, Humpleman neither teaches nor suggests using an object system configured in accordance with a UML. The Examiner asserts that is well known to embody formatting instructions in a unified modeling language. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request that the Examiner provide documentary evidence to support the Examiner's conclusion that an object system configured in accordance with a UML is known in the art of configuring EPGs, as specified in 37 CFR 1.111(b) Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 8 are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Based on all of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in proper condition for allowance. Prompt and favorable action to this effect, and early passing of this application to issue, are respectfully solicited.

Note that no new issue has been introduced into amended claims, and, therefore, no search is needed.

Should the Examiner have any comments, questions, suggestions or objections, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned in order to facilitate reaching a resolution of any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,

By_____

Yuri Kateshov, Esq., Reg. No. 34,466
Tel: 718 637-6027
Fax: 914-723-6802

10